1	2	3
5.	M/s Kalinga Open Cast Project (MCL)	Angul
6.	M/s Bharatpur Project (MCL)	Angul
7.	M/s Sukrangi Chromite Mines (M/s OMC Ltd.)	Jaipura
8.	M/s Kaliapani Chromite Mines (M/s OMC Ltd.)	Jaipura
9.	M/s South Kaliapani Chromite Mines (M/s OMC Ltd.)	Jaipura
10.	M/s Kamarda Chromite Mines	Jaipura
11.	M/s NALCO (CPP)	Angul

Protection of forest wealth in Northern India

658. SHRI S. RAMACHANDRAN PILLAI: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that wildlife population in South India has, of late, shown an increase, owing to measures undertaken by the Centre and State Government in the region;

(b) if so, the details of measures taken; and

(c) whether such measures to protect forest wealth would also be taken for Northern region?

THE MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI T.R. BAALU): (a) to (c) The estimated population of tiger, leopard and elephant in four Southern States for two consecutive census is as follows:

State	1993			1997		
	Tiger	Leopard	Elephant	Tiger	Leopard	Elephant
Andhra Pradesh	197	152	46	171	138	57
Karnataka	305	455	5500	350	620	6088
Kerala	57	16	3500	73	16*	5737
Tamil Nadu	97	138	2400	62	110	2971
Total:	656	761	11446	656	984	14853

NOTE: *Census not done. Hence the figure for 1993 incorporated in 1997 also)

The population are more or less on the same pattern as in other States of the country. Whereas tiger and leopard population has shown increase in some States there is decline in others. Howerver, there is a significant rise in the elephant pupulation of Southern States but selective killing of tuskers are reported from time to time. The Central and the State Governments have taken several initiatives for effective protection of wildlife but the success is limited because of increasing demand of ivory and parts and products from leopards and tigers in the clandestine market across the border. Central Government has been impressing upon State Governments the need to strengthen their wildlife conservation infrastructure. Financial assistance provided to the State Governments for this purpose during the last three years is as follows:

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	Name of the Scheme	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01
1.	Project Tiger	1660.875	1749.162	1918.567
2.	Project Elephant	547.01	596.57	636.85
3.	Development of National Parks & Sanctuaries	934.883	1298.00	2479.984
TOTAL:		3142.768	3643.732	5035.401

Coastal Development

659. SHRI R.S. GAVAI: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received complaints for the non-implementation of the guidelines for coastal development under Coastal Regulation Zone by State Governments;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) action proposed by Government in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI T.R. BAALU): (a) and (b) Yes, Sir. The Government has received complaints from various Non-Governmental Organisations and individuals regarding violation of Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ) Notification, 1991 in the coastal states of Gujarat, Maharashtra, Goa, Kerala, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Orissa and West Bengal.